

# Protestant Theology in Scotland and Germany in the Early Days of the Reformation

REV. PROFESSOR GERHARD MÜLLER,  
DR. THEOL., D.D.

The history of the Scottish Reformation merits a prominent place in a comparative history of the Reformation, which still has to be written. Here, the various elements which, as a rule, governed the Reformation are all present: involvement of the nobles and burgesses, influence of the printed word, impact of oral testimony, the opposition between, on the one hand, royal central authority and the established hierarchy, and, on the other hand, both the rising bourgeois forces and the power-hungry aristocracy, and much else. All this had particularly distinct consequences in Scotland, due to the fact that the Reformation here was not established in a short span of time — one sees instead the struggle of different forces over decades. When the circulation of Lutheran books was prohibited for the first time by the Scottish Parliament in 1525, a fluctuating history began which did not just come to an end in 1560, rather, it simply experienced a striking turning-point.

If this way of looking at things is correct, the Scottish Reformation does differ from that in other lands in a characteristic way. In Germany, the situation was totally different, since the territorial rulers had secured for themselves their own sphere of rights alongside that of the Emperor. In Denmark and in Sweden, the Reformation was largely ushered in from the top — it was therefore a matter for the central authority — whereas in Scotland, the resistance of the central authority impeded the Reformation for decades. In England, due to the decisions of Henry VIII, a special point of departure existed in any case, and which led to the peculiar formation of the Anglican Church. In Italy and Spain, the Reformation never became a movement sufficiently broad — either in the ruling classes or among the lower estates — for the Reformation to have had any prospect of success. Owing to the cantonal organization, there was in Switzerland almost an “intensification” of German conditions, but no analogy to Scotland. The original conditions in France, the Netherlands, Hungary and Poland provide the nearest parallel to those in Scotland. Yet in none of these countries did the Reformation develop similarly to that in Scotland; in France, the protestants were only able to secure toleration for a while. They were to be denied ultimate victory. Conditions were also different in the Low Countries — they split, and in their northern region there was a

struggle not just for the freedom of evangelical proclamation, but at the same time also for freedom from the Spanish. In Hungary, as in Poland, it was initially Germans who adopted the new faith — something which did not make the spread of the Reformation among the native populations any easier. This is true for Hungary in particular, where it was characteristic that only the second wave of the Reformation coming from Geneva found approval among the Magyars. But in Poland as well, a stock of Reformation ideas failed to win wide acceptance. It is true that Poles, like Scots, studied in Wittenberg; but among the population at large in Poland, the Reformation faith never achieved any popularity. In contrast to this, while the Reformation was rejected at an early date in Scotland, evangelical ideas, for all that, were circulated in writing and by word of mouth. In the period between the early proclamation and the later efforts under Knox, no confessional antagonism — now Lutheran, now Reformed — was taken for granted. On the contrary, Patrick Hamilton, the first martyr of the Scottish Reformation, is cited by Knox as a man from whom crucial impulses emanated. This is not the place to analyse why Scotland became a Protestant country, and why France and Poland did not. Yet the Scottish Reformation had its peculiarities, which are unmistakeable.

If the early phase of the Reformation merits attention today, it is certainly not just because of the memory of Patrick Hamilton, burned some 450 years ago in St Andrews. There are other pertinent considerations besides this; and it is important to make the point that there were decades in which evangelical proclamation in Scotland was not prescribed by Geneva — whereby the lines of communication traversed France in the main. After all, young Scots were studying at Wittenberg and propagating a new theology from there. At that time, people were also not afraid to avail themselves of the labours of Englishmen who shared the same language, such as Tyndale's translation of the New Testament, just as by the same token, the Englishman, John Frith, translated Patrick Hamilton's "*Loci communes*" into English "to the profite of my natioun", as he himself writes in his preface. Thereby the text has been passed on to us.

Patrick's "*Places*", as a source, is not only indispensable for this topic, it is in fact a remarkable piece of evidence which can be integrated into Protestant theology of the early period of the Reformation and linked to Melanchthon's *Loci communes* of 1521 and the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530.

Patrick Hamilton gave his work the title of "*Loci*" or "*Loci communes*". It is evident from its literary history that the work was originally submitted in Latin, having been produced for an academic disputation at the newly-founded Protestant university in Marburg. This is testified by Patrick's teacher there, Francis

Lambert, a Frenchman. It was the first academic occasion of this kind carried out at the new university, and it speaks for the power of the Reformation, a power surmounting national boundaries, especially when it is recalled that, in a German land, it was a Scot and a Frenchman who were the protagonists in this affair. When Lambert writes that in Germany Patrick wanted to be guided more into God's truth, but that he scarcely had met with anyone who knew how to speak more spiritually and sincerely about God's word, this cannot simply be dismissed as an exaggeration, as was universally customary at that time — especially among the humanists. On the contrary, one can consider this as justified on the basis of the text under discussion, for Patrick had only been a few months in Germany; consequently he was in no position to have been studying for very long, and yet in his text, he demonstrates that he was very much at home in Reformation theology. In the presence of Lambert, he upheld his theses "publicly and very eruditely", as the former reports. It is clear enough from Lambert's own words that these theses did not originate with him, yet it is known, as a rule, that theses for a disputation were often, or almost always, drawn up by academic teachers.

Patrick's "Places" only deal with a few topics: Law, Gospel and Faith, central Reformation concerns. Law and Gospel are distinguished in Luther's sense, maybe even much more so than Luther had wanted or done, if the Law is understood only as an exacting power which makes us realize that we cannot save ourselves and have to look for help elsewhere. The Ten Commandments show what is bidden in respect of good and what is forbidden in respect of evil; among these, Patrick includes the ban on images as being the second commandment, and so, unlike Luther, does not follow that mediaeval tradition which had let this commandment fall into abeyance. On this point also, there is then no schoolboyish dependence on the Wittenberg Reformer. It is very soon apparent that Patrick does not want to render anything other than biblical teaching — Bible passages are repeatedly quoted which verify what has been said by him or introduce new statements. The *sola scriptura* of the Reformation applies without reservation. The deductions he makes are also conspicuous. In good scholastic manner, an "ergo" conclusion is drawn from preceding statements. If this looks like drawing logical conclusions for their own sake, it was nonetheless common then and is found in other Reformation theologians, such as Andreas Osiander.

Very much in contrast to this reasoning, which is in keeping with a disputation, are statements of a confessional kind, in which all knowledge and methods of the schools are dispensed with. For example, Patrick did not define the Gospel in such a way; instead he formulated it by means of propositions arranged in order



alongside each other, like the following: "Christ is the Saviour of the World. Christ is our Saviour. Christ deid for us. Christ deid for our synnes". With axioms of this kind one is not defining, and is certainly not being deductive, rather one is describing, indeed confessing and it is left to the listener or reader to acknowledge this as being meant for him personally.

The contrast between Law and Gospel is also expressed in straightforward maxims of the following kind: "The Law schawith us, Our synne. Our condemnatioun, . . . Is the word of displeasure. The Gospell schawith us, A reamedy for it. Our redemptioun, . . . Is the word of peace". The descriptions are intended to make what one is saying comprehensible, more intelligible than formal distinctions could give expression to. It may be recalled that Luther regarded it as a task of utmost difficulty to differentiate Law and Gospel correctly. He was prepared to admit anyone capable of doing this to the theological doctorate, and so let them teach theology. Patrick submits himself to this exercise set by Luther; accordingly, he is dealing with a theme central to Luther's theology. Distinguishing them sharply, he opposes Law and Gospel to each other. To give a few more axioms by way of example: "The Law sayith, . . . Quhair is thy rychteousnes, goodnes, and satisfioun? Thou art bound and obligat unto me, [to] the devill, and [to] hell. The Gospell sayith, . . . Christ is thy rychtousnes, thy goodnes, and satisfioun. Christ hath delivered thee from thame all". Such declarations do depart from the rails of academic training: they convey a confessional character and they make it plain that, for their composer and defender, it is not a matter of academic rhetoric, a university-prescribed exercise or mental drill; on the contrary, what is at stake is the proclamation of that which he has discerned as truth.

In Patrick's "Common Places", much space is devoted to the question of faith. Closely connected with this is the problem of good works, which is treated at the end. In other words, the real question at issue is justification, that central Reformation theme which Martin Luther had invoked in his struggle against the inadequacies in the theology of his time. Faith is characterized as trust in God. Whoever believes God, also believes his Word and takes what He says as true. Whoever does not believe God, makes him out to be a liar and rejects God himself. At this point, disputation-like distinctions are embarked upon once again. An example of this may be seen in remarks immediately after James 1: 17: "Everie good thing is the gift of God". "Fayth is good. Ergo, faith is the gift of God." Or, alternatively, he argues: "The gift of God is not in oure power. Faith is the gift of God. Ergo, fayth is not in oure power." From this, it is obvious enough that Patrick did take over the strictly theological interpretation of the Reformation: faith is no human virtue, no theological, Christian-

virtue either, rather an *opus dei*. That does not mean that works are no concern of God, that possibly even vices are pleasing to him. On the contrary, wherever God takes action, he sets afoot entire processes. Wherever he brings about faith, he calls into being a new, good human being, who does what is pleasing to God, who indeed is only *capable* of good, like the good tree, which only yields good fruit.

It is only logical that, in this connection, justification is now spoken of explicitly. Patrick does this by heading a chapter with the words: "A man is justified be faith". In the presence of God, then, righteousness is righteousness of faith, and in fact — this must be added — righteousness of faith *only*, not righteousness of works. When what is said in this chapter is examined closely, only Bible passages are found. Patrick is content with quoting a few verses which he takes from the exclusive norm of Christian proclamation and doctrine, in order to expound and account for his understanding of justification. At the same time, however, faith is also interpreted as faith of Christ, and with the following words: "The faith of Christ is, to beleve in him; that is, to beleve his wourd, and to beleve that he will helpe thee in all thy neid, and deliver thee from evill". Faith in God and faith in Christ are therefore closely correlated: both are trust, trust in the Creator and Redeemer who was sent. Whoever believes, listens to what they have to say. He is certain that they have sufficient power to realize what they have proclaimed. Whoever does not do this, would make the Deity into a liar, deprive it of its power and contest its divinity.

The Word of Christ is the Gospel. This is borne out with a profusion of Bible passages. Christ's Word is not the Law — he is (speaking with Luther) no new Moses — rather, Christ's Word is the Gospel. The consequence of faith in Christ is adoption by God. Patrick quotes: "Thei that beleve in Jesus Christ ar the sones of God". And from this he concludes: "Ye ar all the sones of God, because ye beleve in Jesus Christ". At this point the disputation style is completely abandoned; the listener and reader are addressed directly; the academic occasion is turned into a sermon. The same basic ideas are often repeated — an indication of how important it is to Patrick that his declarations be understood and admitted, and indeed believed.

Just as Law and Gospel had been compared with one another in order to bring out their particular features more strongly, belief and unbelief are also now juxtaposed. As he puts it:

"Faith is the root of all good:  
Makith God and man freindis.  
Bringith God and man to gither.  
Incredulitie is the root of all evill:  
Makith thame deidlie foes.  
Bringith thame syndrie . . .

Faith only maketh a man,  
 The member of Christ;  
 The inheritour of heavin;  
 The servand of God.  
 Faith schewith God to be a sweit Father . . .  
 Faith knowith God: Lovith God and his nychtbourne . . .  
 Incredulitie maketh him,  
 The member of the devill;  
 The inheritour of hell;  
 The servand of the devill.  
 Incredulitie maketh God a terrible Judge . . .  
 Incredulitie knoweth him nott.  
 Incredulitie lovith nether God nor nychtbour."

The comparisons tabulated seem appropriate for the purpose of grasping important attributes of belief and unbelief. Moreover, the connection between faith and knowledge of God is enunciated with a clarity not normally expressed until Luther's *Großer Katechismus* of 1529. There the Reformer did speak of God and faith belonging together. God is to us according to how we believe him. Precisely this, however, is already being stated in Hamilton's text: an essential element of the Reformation understanding of God has been perceived and interpreted by Hamilton, and indeed prior to Luther's familiar remarks on the subject.

When he turns now to Hope and Love, Patrick does not digress from the main topic. Faith, Hope and Love, "these three" (I Corinthians 13: 13), are so intimately connected in mediaeval theology that it would otherwise have been a matter for surprise if alongside discussion on faith, there had been no treatment of Hope and Love. Yet, these, too, are not understood as human or Christian virtues; instead, they are explained from the point of view of scripture. Hamilton claims that it is imperative to put one's hope in God alone and nothing else. Love is interpreted as love of one's neighbour, which is to be bestowed on all men without respect of person or nation. In a comparison between faith, hope and love, the precedence of faith — soundly Protestant — is given prominence: "Faith cometh of the wound of God: Hope commeth of faith; and Charitie springis of thame boith." Or a bit further on: "Faith looketh to God and his worde: Hope lookith unto his gift and reward: Charitie lookith unto hir nychtbouris proffeit".

Following a logical pattern, it is the question of good works with which the conclusion is taken up. It was necessary for this to be treated in connection with the discussion on faith and, hence, justification. Here too the Protestant position is clearly held: "No maner of werkis mack us rycheouse". Rather, we are justified by faith only. The Law, which is what works have to do with, cannot justify us. Should it be otherwise, then Christ would have died in vain. Therefore, one has to proceed from the assumption that



nothing “that ever God maid, or might maike, might help us out of” sins. “Ergo, no . . . werkis maie mack us rychteous”. With Luther and the entire Reformation, the christological grounds of justification are then clearly set out here: if one single person were able to justify himself, then the mission of Jesus Christ would not have been absolutely necessary.

Patrick pursues these considerations by putting his argument in the form of an inversion: if works are not able to justify us, then they are also unable to make us unjust. They make us, he says, “nether good nor evill”. This is not, however, to be understood as antinomianism; instead, the argument is developed out of the nature of works. The work is always secondary. By definition, the good man always does good, the evil man on the other hand only evil. Therefore, it is not a question of what our deeds appear like; at issue rather is the matter of their origins: whoever God considers as righteous, does good works. The righteous man acts as a believing man. “And all that is done in faith pleasith God, and argud werkis”. At all events, works have absolutely nothing to do with justification. This is repeated several times — it is almost as if he were hammering it home in order to obviate any misunderstanding; in fact it turns into an imploring exclamation; “O how ready would we be to help otheris, yf we knew his [Christ’s] goodnes and gentilnes towardis us! He is a good and gentill Lord, and he doith all thingis for nought. Let us, I beseich yow, follow his footsteps, whome all the world ought to prayse and wirschep. Amen”. Not everyone may find this style in an academic document to their taste. However, in the context of the sixteenth century it is not yet possible to presuppose a nice separation between university and church. The lecture is also *professio*: why not, then, even more unmistakeably, *confessio*, as in this instance?

The conclusion takes the form of the proposition that advocating righteousness of works puts men in the place of God. Hamilton maintains his position firmly: “I condempne not good werkis; but I condempne the fals trust in any werkis; for all the werkis that a man putteth confidence in, are thairwyth intoxicat or empoisoned, and become evill. Quhairfoir, do good werkis; but we war thow do thame to gett any good throw thame; for yf thow do, thow receavest the good, not as a gift of God, bott as debte unto thee, and makest thy self fellow with God.” Whoever does this must expect the fate of Lucifer, who was ejected from heaven.

Patrick’s theses, therefore, turn out to be a document of more than one stratum. They are “aliquot axiomata”, as Francis Lambert called them. But they are also “Loci communes” in Melanchthon’s sense, since the central concerns of the Reformation are brought out by them. And furthermore, they are a *confessio*, a creed, by means of which their author wishes to preach, evangelize, and to liberate men from false conceptions and bring them to the

proper understanding of Law, Gospel and Faith and hence to the true saving faith. To Francis Lambert, Patrick Hamilton hailed from a corner, a nook of the earth — to a certain extent from the end of the world: “ab illo mundi angulo, nempe Scotia”, as he put it. It is well known what fate awaited him there when he did not renounce his ideas in his native land. Of abiding importance is the clarity with which the Bible is claimed as being the norm of theology. Conspicuous is the relationship affirmed between God and faith and the weight assigned to the redemptive activity of Jesus.

On the basis of the title, a parallel between Patrick's “Common Places” and Melanchthon's *Loci communes* is immediately suggested. It is possible, of course, that the title may not originate directly with Hamilton; at all events, it cannot be ruled out that it was only added at publication, whereby Frith springs to mind as being the originator. However, the title would then have been formulated with sympathetic understanding. If Patrick himself made it up, he could thereby have given a hint of his direct dependence on the *Praeceptor Germaniae*. Unlike the scholastics, Patrick is not concerned with a harmonious system; he confines himself instead to a few but central theological themes; Melanchthon's approach in his *Loci communes* is exactly the same. There, the bondage of the will is first of all discussed, then the Law, sin, Gospel, grace, justification, faith. Patrick Hamilton has dealt with almost all these topics as well. That Melanchthon raises other questions besides — that of the sacraments for example — is no wonder, considering the fact that he wanted to write a textbook which was intended to replace Peter Lombard's *Commentary on the Sentences*. But the *crucial* theological difficulty tackled is the same one which Patrick addressed himself to, and he was only providing a basis for discussion at an academic gathering: to both, the vital issues are Law and Gospel, sin and grace. For both, faith, hope and love are “divine gifts of grace” and not “Christian virtues”, which one can secure with effort. And what is even more important: both make a sharp distinction between Law and Gospel. At this point, Luther's stress was somewhat different. According to him, faith accepts the “entire Word of God”. With Melanchthon, on the other hand, “God as ‘severus iudex’ . . . is not conceived as the object of faith, rather . . . only as his threat”. The same thing may be said of Hamilton. He too distinguished sharply — as was already seen — between Law and Gospel, and so is closer to Melanchthon on this point than Luther. When at the end of his exposition on grace, Melanchthon says, “his presentation of the relationship of Law and Gospel is unsatisfactory; the brief treatment does not permit the problem to be discussed with the necessary rigour”, then this may well be grounded in an awareness of differences from Luther, without managing to arrive at a self-



contained conception. Patrick could have referred to the brevity of his exposition in a much more justified way. This he did not do. However, shifts of accent do not befall him in the way they occur in the considerably more extensive work of Melanchthon. He managed a clear and concise presentation, which he maintained with no reservations. From the point of view of theological content and in regard to the title of his exposition, he is very close to Melanchthon.

It is actually something of a surprise that Hamilton gave his exposition the title of “Loci”. They could just as easily have been called “Axiomata” (as Lambert characterized them) or “Disputatio” (as Luther wrote over his Indulgence theses of 1517) or “Theseis” or something similar. In 1526, Patrick’s teacher, Lambert, had drawn up *Paradoxa*, which served as a basis for the Synod of Homberg, which was instrumental in having the Reformation introduced into Hesse. As the title suggests, these were provocative theses. Any attempt to win over the listener by means of logical reasoning, as in a disputation such as was found in the case of Patrick, recedes. But in Patrick’s “Loci”, as well as in Lambert’s *Paradoxa*, definite propositions are made: woolly formulations of a compromising kind are avoided. The Word of God is characterized by both as the sole standard of the Church. According to a formulation of Lambert’s, the Word of Christ is “the key to the Kingdom of Heaven”: heaven is opened by nothing else. Faith is the touchstone which decides whether heaven is opened: if it is present, the Kingdom of God is accessible. But where there is unbelief, it remains locked. So here, as with Patrick Hamilton, central importance is assigned to faith. Lambert calls the *fides historica* inadequate. Only faith, “through which we trust God”, makes us righteous. Righteousness of works is rejected: both Works of God’s Law and works made up by oneself are unable to induce the grace of God. But where there is faith, there “the Law of God is also readily kept”, there good works are done. To quote verbatim from Lambert: “Faith liberates us from every thing which hinders us from serving God and our neighbour freely”.

Here too, the similarity with Patrick Hamilton is apparent. It is possible, however, that Patrick’s propositions are rather more emphatic, since they do not at all go into externals, ceremonies and abuses, and all that which Lambert had to lay out if he wanted to highlight the necessity of a Reformation. This forcefulness, so clearly seen in Patrick’s “Places”, can, however, also be connected with his lucid differentiations, with his formal distinctions and with his repetitions. He, too, wants to convince. But whereas Lambert is appealing to the provincial diet of Hesse who were largely laymen, Patrick is speaking to theologians and anyone ready and capable of discussing theological questions. From the point of view of form,

Patrick's "Places" are closer to Lambert's *Paradoxa* than to Melanchthon's *Loci*. However, Patrick did not just draw up short theses, as was largely the case with Lambert, so that one cannot make the writing of the Frenchman in 1526 the direct model for the "Loci" of 1527.

Luther's "Bekenntnis", with which he terminated his writing of 1528 on the Lord's Supper, was also occasioned by factors completely different from those which gave rise to Patrick's "Places". The Wittenberg theologian says himself that deviations from the right doctrine made him resolve to make a summary presentation of what his thoughts on the Christian faith are and what he intends to answer for before the Judgement Seat of Jesus Christ. In a comprehensive profession of faith, it is natural that more is touched upon than in "Loci", in the main heads of theological doctrine. Consequently, Luther begins with the doctrine of the Trinity, outlines his Christ-orientated faith, emphasizes the importance of the Holy Spirit, and ends with ecclesiology, with which the discussion of individual ecclesiastical customs and abuses is connected. The arrangement is accordingly completely different from that in Patrick. But how far may similarities or differences in content be detected?

In Luther, one looks in vain for discussion of Law and Gospel. In his Confession, he foregoes completely what in his opinion is endowed with normative force within theology. Still, the matter does come up. Contained in his testimony to Christ is the statement that without the Son of God there is only death and sin for man. Whoever does not have Christ, has in his stead the Devil as "God and Prince". Without God, there is no righteousness and life. For that, sin is far too heavy. There is no such thing as righteousness by works nor by means of the sublime form of pious modes of life and religious vows. Whoever thinks that it is possible to become sanctified out of one's own power as a monk or a nun denies Jesus Christ as sole help and only Redeemer. In the doctrine of sin and justification, there are therefore no differences between Patrick's "Loci" and Luther's *Bekenntnis*. Luther's writing, which came out later than Hamilton's, is in its basic Reformation tenor, and without prejudice to the broader thematic scope, similar to the "Places" of the Scots theologian. In his theological testament, the Wittenberger, too, calls faith in Jesus Christ the "only path to blessedness". As well, he does get round to speaking about works. Along with Patrick, he does stress the importance of good works. But they occur to the "praise and honour" of God, and are fruits of faith, but not preconditions of justification.

Theological harmony between the two works then can be established. Whether divergences would have crept in if Luther had not just spoken about the "Gospel" in his writing, but of Law and Gospel as well, must remain open. In Luther's mind, there is a

certain flexibility of interpretation within Reformation theology. He wanted simply to set the limits within which evangelical theology functions. It is obvious that Patrick's utterances are within this scope. If, in regard to the definition of the relationship between Law and Gospel, he approximates more to Melanchthon than to Luther, then the way he arranges Christology and justification together connects him with the latter: both are of the opinion that there can be no auto-justification of the sinner because of the incarnation of the Son of God.

Whereas Luther's Confession was written in 1528, the *Somme chrestienne* of Patrick's academic teacher was not printed until 1529. It is worthwhile going into, since it may be possible to elicit from this little book if there are tangible links between Hamilton's work and that of the Frenchman. The writing of the latter work, of course, was occasioned by something completely different from that which gave rise to the Disputation Theses of 1527. It was conceivably written on behalf of the Hessian Landgrave, Philip, who wanted to give the Emperor, Charles VI, information on the evangelical faith. In any case, Philip arranged for it to be handed over to the Emperor during his stay in Upper Italy — thereby he anticipated something which Charles V provided for in his invitation to the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, namely, information on the different theological conceptions in Germany. Lambert wrote his book in French, of which the Emperor "had a command like his native tongue". Plainly, it was intended that Charles V should be able to familiarize himself as easily as possible with Reformation theology.

Lambert lays down the Bible as the criterion for Christian doctrine. With the aid of the Bible, the Imperial Majesty is at liberty to examine the different theological dogmas. He ought not to "rely" on the judgement of others "because 'many are out only to gain an advantage', without inquiring into the truth". If Charles "puts any 'reliance' on the 'opinion of others' ", he will not be able to excuse himself "in the presence of God". In all seriousness then, Lambert supposes that the Emperor will himself take the writing in hand, "in which he has summarized everything as briefly as possible", because Charles V is "extremely busy", and so form his own opinion. Along with Lambert's Apology, a New Testament in French translation was presented to the Emperor in order to facilitate as much as possible the testing of the controversial doctrines with the help of Scripture.

With the title of his work, Patrick Hamilton's Marburg teacher already brings out his concern to develop a consistent theological system — not for nothing does he link up with scholastic linguistic usage, which Melanchthon and Patrick had just abandoned. It was indeed by all means necessary for an Apology to be comprehensive as well — a rough draft of the whole



of Protestant theology had to be made for the Emperor, if he was to be convinced of its Biblical basis. Consequently, one should not be diverted by the difference of aim from investigating the similarities and divergences in the topics with which Patrick had dealt.

The point of departure of both theologians is similar: the touchstone of Christian doctrine is sacred Scripture. In all the arguments of controversial theology at the time of the Reformation, this was the condition on the Protestant side. It was important to Francis Lambert to proceed from this basis, with a view to bringing about the recognition of evangelical doctrine by the Emperor. In comparison to this, Patrick had made use of a definite standard for his theological distinctions. The result of both is the reclamation of the Bible as the basis of proclamation and doctrine. This is then also directly connected with the reference to Gospel and Law, whereby Lambert speaks of the "Gospel of Jesus Christ" and the "Divine Law", and deals with them in this order. In contrast to this, Patrick — like Luther and Melanchthon — happened to speak of the Law before he turned to the Gospel. Yet from the point of view of content, the authors are in sympathy with one another. Lambert calls the Gospel of Jesus Christ "the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins through his holy name", while Hamilton confines himself to descriptive statements at this point. However, the Law is represented by both as something which makes sin known, but which is of no help for righteousness. Only through faith does one arrive at that, by trust in God. For the Christian, faith is reckoned to righteousness. Lambert upholds — like Melanchthon — an imputative doctrine of justification. Self-justification is impossible, since otherwise Christ's death would have been in vain, as is stated with reference to Galatians 2: 21. But faith is not idle, rather very active in love — Lambert understands Galatians 5: 6 therefore like Luther and not as the Vulgate. All this is held equally by Patrick, more concisely, and either in keeping with the disputation or, indeed, in more edifying formulations.

The Frenchman goes into good works as well. He is of the opinion that no work is good if it does not come from faith, and then continues: "Living faith justifies before God and good works justify, i.e. they give evidence that he who does them is just; I am saying: they justify before Man." While Patrick had emphasized the secondary character of the work, that is, its dependence on him who does it, Lambert toys with the idea of justification: Good works are marks of faith but on no account means by which God can be made gracious. This is said again at a later point, when Lambert speaks about "meritum". Nevertheless, a certain divergence between Patrick and Lambert regarding the understanding of works will have to be affirmed: Patrick Hamilton consistently upholds the rejection of righteousness of works, whilst

Lambert, if advocating righteousness of faith, would like to interpret the work as justification before Man. Patrick would seem here to be closer than Lambert to Luther. On the whole however, both remain within the sphere of the newly-discovered biblical theology.

Melanchthon's *Loci* was intended to replace the current theological textbook of scholasticism. Lambert's *Paradoxa* had tried to impress the inauguration of the Reformation of the Church on the Hessian provincial diet. Patrick's "Places" were the basis for an academic colloquy with scholastic, but also with edifying tendencies. Luther's *Bekenntnis* was intended to be of assistance in the defence against false doctrines in his own domain, while Lambert's *Somme chrestienne* aimed to convince the Emperor of the truth of evangelical doctrine. All these important theological documents of the 1520s have therefore the aim of marking out the limits. The same is true for the *Confessio Augustana*: the idea of that is to demonstrate that no heresies are represented in Protestant congregations. This is done in such a way that the continuity with the orthodox tradition of Christianity is affirmed. Some things are only mentioned — for example, indulgences, pilgrimages or excommunication — but not expressly discussed, so as not to aggravate discord. Other things like the position of the pope or purgatory are not even mentioned by name, since only fundamental theological matters are intended to come up for discussion. Consequently, as regards the Roman theology and Church, the *Confessio Augustana* is an ecumenical symbol.

In it, the point of departure is the Early Church doctrine of the Trinity and Christology. Also in regard to original sin, the anti-Pelagian tradition is professed. Significantly, the quoting of many Bible passages is abstained from. Not until the 4th article on justification is Romans 3: 4 referred to. It is now at this point, however, that the Christological basis of justification and the rejection of righteousness of works is brought out. The importance of the Gospel is apparent from one of the later articles (7). Finally, the connection of faith and works is extensively discussed (Art. 20). Here then also, close links between the theological propositions of Patrick and the formulations of the *Confessio Augustana* are to be established. Man's sin and God's grace, faith and works are dealt with similarly in both compositions. The most important confession of the Lutheran Reformation and the first great testimony of the Scottish Reformation are theologically intimately connected.

With these indications, there the matter must rest. One could set about making the inverse analysis, and ascertain the strong divergences of the "Places" of Patrick from the non-Lutheran currents of his time. At any rate, there is nothing to link him with the mysticism and Doomsday theology of Thomas Müntzer.

Patrick has no thought of calling for a "League" against the godless and forestalling with the sword the judgement of God on sinners. Also Carlstadt's peculiarities — which emerged in the Wittenberg troubles — have no influence on Patrick's "Loci". One finds no hint of any urge for a pure community, as in the Anabaptists. Nor does one find anything of their criticism of the all too inconsistent Reformation. Nor have spiritualist ideas — such as those of a Caspar von Schwenckfeld — had any influence on Patrick's text. On the contrary, it takes up a position closely aligned to the utterances of Melanchthon, Luther, and Lambert. In relation to them, he does safeguard his original elements. Yet he is to be placed in the entire picture of the German Reformation of the 1520s and he does enrich it. Moreover, he represents a link between Scotland and Germany, which later became weaker through Knox, but which historians and theologians ought not to forget or underestimate.

Patrick's Disputation was probably the sole occasion of this kind in Marburg for some time to come — others were evidently not in a position like him to defend theological propositions in an academic form. It was, therefore, a loss for the young university that he went off again so quickly. It was also a loss for Scotland that his involvement in theology and the Church came to an end so soon. Still, his "Places" survive; and it would be a pleasant outcome if the present discussion resulted in this important work being published for its significance by means of a critical edition, in which the underlying theological and historical connections were analysed and identified.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This paper, translated by Dr Ian Hazlett, was first delivered in St Andrews in July 1978 in commemoration of the 450th anniversary of Patrick Hamilton's death.

#### *Editor's Bibliographical Note on the Sources*

P. Lorimer, *Patrick Hamilton* (Edinburgh, 1857) provides details of Hamilton's career. For "Patrick's Places", see *The Works of John Knox*, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1846-64), 6 vols., i, 19-35. A critical discussion of the text is provided by R. Haas, *Franz Lambert und Patrick Hamilton in ihrer Bedeutung für die Evangelische Bewegung auf den Britischen Inseln* (Marburg doctoral thesis, printed privately 1973).

Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* is available in *Corpus Reformatorum*, edd. C. G. Bretschneider and H. E. Bindseil, XXI (Brunswick, 1854), *Melanthonis Opera . . . Omnia*, 81-227. See also C. L. Manschreck, *Melanchthon on Christian doctrine, Loci Communes*, 1555 (New York, 1965).

The Augsburg Confession is printed in B. J. Kidd, *Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford, 1920) and, together with Luther's Greater Catechism, in *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelische-lutherischen Kirche* (Berlin, 1848). On Luther, see also *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, vol. 26, pp. 261-509; vol. 30 (i), pp. 426-536; vol. 59, pp. 198-200.

The text of Lambert's *Paradoxa ad Ecclesiarum Hassicarum Reformationem in*



*Synodo Hassiaca ab eo proposita et asserta* is available in Daniel Gerdes, *Miscellanea Duisburgensia edita, inedita, vetera, nova theologica, historica, philologica etc.*, 2 vols., Groningen, 1732. On Lambert, see also *The summe of christianie gatheryd out almoste of al placis of scripture by . . . Francis Lambert of Auynyon*, London, 1536.

*Editor.*

